

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 27, 2006. Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95, 98 to 113, 115, 117 and 119 are in the application. Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are independent. Claims 1, 26, 29, 54, 57, 82, 85 and 110 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Tang for her courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during a personal interview conducted at the Patent and Trademark Office on April 21, 2006. Present at the interview were Examiner Tang and Primary Examiner Larry Donaghue (on behalf of the PTO) and Daniel Glueck and technical advisor Michael Guzniczak (on behalf of the Applicants). Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview follows.

During the interview, the non-obviousness type double patenting rejection and the § 103(a) rejection of the independent claims, which are traversed, were discussed.

It was agreed that the non-obviousness type double patenting rejection was entered improvidently and would be withdrawn.

In regards to the § 103(a) rejection, it was explained that European Patent No. 952513 (White) is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of accessing policy rules for a print queue and creating a print queue based on the policy rules. While not necessarily agreeing to this viewpoint, Primary Examiner Donaghue nevertheless conceded that White failed to show that policy rules for the queue are entered by a system administrator.

Therefore, an amendment was proposed wherein the independent claims reflect that the policy rules are entered by a system administrator. Primary Examiner Donaghue indicated that if such an amendment were made, White would be overcome as a reference. Applicants understand herefrom that the rejection would be obviated.

Accordingly, and in accordance with the agreements made at the interview, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include the substance of dependent Claims 114, 116, 118 and 120, which all refer to entry of policy rules by a system administrator, and have cancelled these dependent claims. In this regard, Applicants submit that the phrase "system administrator" as used in the claims refers to a user who is authorized to enter or manage policy rules for a queue.

In light of the agreements made during the interview and the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 113535v1